DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 200 IR 052 543

AUTHOR Hayes, James
TITLE A Survey of Characteristics of Control of State Documents by State Document Authorities.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 46p.; M.L.S. Thesis, State University of New York at Albany.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Archives; *Classification; Databases; *Depository Libraries; *Documentation; *Government Role; Hypothesis Testing; Information Dissemination; Information Services; Masters Theses; Online Systems; Power Structure; Questionnaires; Reference Services; *State Agencies; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Ephemera

ABSTRACT

This master's thesis presents the results of a survey designed to study the control of state documents by state document authorities. A questionnaire was developed and sent to the institutions in each state which are responsible for the official collection of their state's documents, in an effort to determine the degree of adherence to guidelines adopted for the control of state documents and the variety of methods used to control state publications. Forty-two (84%) of the 50 states surveyed responded. These data were used to test three hypotheses: (1) states which collect documents from other states house them separately from documents of their own state; (2) states which collect ephemera do not classify them; and (3) most states use established classification schemes to control their state's publications. Discussion of data pertaining directly to the hypotheses comprises the main body of the paper and other parts of the survey are used to supplement the findings. It was concluded that the future of automation may hold the answer to many current problems associated with the control of state documents. Copies of the questionnaire and documents pertinent to the survey are appended. (34 notes, 44 references) (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301200

IR

A SURVEY OF CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTROL OF STATE DOCUMENTS BY STATE DOCUMENT AUTHORITIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

James Hayes

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for

the M.L.S. degree

at

The State University of New York

at Albany

LIS 680: Information Sources and Services

Professor Joe Morehead

December, 1987

IR052543

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John C. Hayes
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"State documents are the official pronouncements of the agencies that issue them. Their purpose is to impart information to the citizen who has paid for the gathering and dissemination of the information through taxes".

Margaret Lane. State Publications and Depository Libraries: A Reference Handbook. p.17.

Contents Page

Abstract 3

Introduction 4

Hypotheses 4

Methodology/Limitations 5

Definitions 5

Findings

Hypothesis 1 6

Hypothesis 2 7

Hypothesis 3 7

Archival repositories 9

Additional Areas of Concern

1) Obtaining State Documents

a) Selection and Acquisition 10

b) Legislation/Solicitation 10

c) Exchange 11

d) Gifts 11

e) Publishing 11

2) Automation 12

3) Reference 13

4) Depositories 14

Conclusion 15

Recommendations for further study 16

Notes 17

Bibliography 20

Appendix I - Questionnaire 23
Appendix II - Checklists 25
Appendix III - Characteristics of responding institutions 27
Appendix IV - Collection sizes 36
Appendix V - Arrangement of documents 37
Appendix VI - Acquisition methods 39
Appendix VII - MARC format codes 41

Abstract

This report is the result of a study of the control of state documents by state document authorities. A questionnaire was developed and sent to the institutions in each state which are responsible for the official collection of their state's documents. Guidelines adopted for the control of state documents are not adhered to in some states, and states employ a variety of methods to control state publications. Forty two (84%) of the 50 states surveyed responded in this study.

Three hypotheses were tested. They are 1) States which collect documents from other states will house them separate from documents of their own state, 2) states which collect ephemera will not classify them, and 3) most states would use established classification schemes to control their state's publications.

Twenty (47.6%) of the responding states collect documents from other states and 4 (20%) of those integrate them with documents of their own state. Thirty one of the thirty five states collecting ephemeral materials classify them. 35.7% of responding institutions employ major established classification schemes, including LC, Dewey, Swank and Jackson.

The future of national online bibliographic databases may hold the answer to many of today's state documents problems, but cooperation between states will be necessary.

Introduction

This report is the result of a survey designed to study the control of state documents by state document authorities. A review of the literature revealed a number of problems, some of which led to this survey. The main concern is that guidelines adopted for the control of state documents are not adhered to in some states, and states employ a great variety of methods in the control of state publications.

The majority of valuable information used in this study came from publications of Margaret Lane. For the most part, there has not been much written on the control of state documents per se, although the user studies of Hernon and McClure were especially helpful for information on reference aspects of state publications. Other sources include the Documents on Documents collection of the ALA Government Documents Roundtable and the serial entitled Documents to the People.

The ALA handbook Standards for library functions at the state level is a useful guide for states to check their policies against, but presently they are more guidelines than standards.

Hypotheses

Several questions spurred the implementation of this study. Three were developed as hypotheses and will be addressed as the main body of the paper.

Hypothesis 1: States which collect documents from other states will house them separate from documents of their own state.

Hypothesis 2: States which collect ephemera will not classify them.

Hypothesis 3: Most states would use established classification schemes to control their state's publications.

Methodology/Limitations

A questionnaire was used in the survey and it was sent to the state document authorities in each state. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix I.

The questionnaire was developed and sent out in the first weeks of the fall semester and the entire survey could only be conducted in the span of one semester, or about 3 months. The three developed hypotheses comprise the main body of the paper and other parts of the survey are used to supplement the findings.

The addresses of the institutions surveyed where garnered from the appendix in the **Directory of Government Document Collections and Librarians**, Section VI, State Document Authorities.

Definitions of a State Document and State Agency

In order to administer and maintain a program for the acquisition and/or distribution of state documents, key terms must be clearly defined. Margaret Lane presents a detailed discussion of this problem in State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. I will only present a handful of examples here, based on the literature sent to me by various states.

In the case of Alabama, the administration there has found that "problems have arisen in defining a state agency and a state publication. Archives staff have tried to reconcile these questions through a compromise of library cataloging procedures and principles of archival provenance."(1) Apparently, they rely on the agency's description of itself and it's relationship to other bodies to determine meanings.

The literature sent to me by the Maryland State Library defines state publications as "Informational materials produced, regardless of format, by the authority of, or at least the total or partial expense of, any state agency",(2) while Minnesota defines a document as "any book, journal, map, pamphlet or report "issued for public distribution" [italics theirs] by any department, agency, or official of the state".(3)

Michigan defines a state document as "any publication issued at government expense by a Michigan department of state, including materials mimeographed or otherwise duplicated for distribution; or any publication issued by the governor...the legislature...."(4) Most state's legislation provides similar definitions, but clearly there could be more

consensus, especially as regards materials which are distributed or published and those which are strictly archival in nature and produced and used for the conducting of daily business.

Louisiana's definition of a public document is exemplary. It allows that "correspondence and inter-office or intra-office memoranda and records of an archival nature are excluded".(5) A major source of confusion regarding the best method for the treatment of state documents is the lack of consensus regarding archival materials. Another is the definition of a state agency.

Closely tied to the definition within each state of exactly what constitutes a state document, is the subsequent treatment of the material according to the implications of that definition. If agreement could be reached on the best definition of a state agency publication, the variety of opinion on the best method of treatment of those materials, whether as archives or not, might be eliminated. Other problem areas in definition, especially in regard to legislation, will be discussed further on.

No effective national program can ever be developed without consensus on at least the meanings of essential terms.

Findings

Hypothesis 1: States which collect documents from other states will house them separate from documents of their own state.

Twenty (47.6%) of the responding states collect documents from other states. Of those, four (20%) integrate them with their own state's documents.

The integration of state document bibliographic records into the central catalog is recommended throughout the literature but of the institutions responding to this survey, only 26 (61.9%) do so, either partially or fully.

The debate over integration of state publications into the general collection was not intended to be addressed by this survey. One state however, Minnesota, offered that "our state documents are cataloged and integrated into our collection". One advantage to physical integration is that materials would tend to be used more, in an open stacks environment. The variety of format, size, and predominantly pamphlet nature of many state publications might make integration an especially difficult practice to maintain for many states.

In her article Classifying state documents, Alice Alderman reported that "most authorities are firm in the opinion that documents, state as well as federal, are better handled in a collection separate from that of the trade books". (6)

The intent of this survey regarding documents from other states was simply to ascertain whether the institutions seek them out and how they arrange them once they have obtained them. Many libraries will continue to rely on the Center for Research Libraries, the Library of Congress, and the New York Public Library for access to the most comprehensive collections available and will utilize inter-library loan to satisfy patron needs.

Hypothesis 2: States which collect ephemera will not classify them.

Thirty one (88.5%) of the states collecting ephemera classify them. Considering the justification for any treatment of ephemeral materials, Thomas Heenan outlined the problem saying, "the cataloging of ephemeral material would be inadvisable; and yet in the case of local publications these items are sometimes the most valuable to the patron". (7) The same might be said of ephemeral publications on the state level.

Most states recognize the potential value of much ephemeral materials and have expanded their schemes to include a means for classifying them. Of the states responding, 34 (80.9%) make an effort to collect ephemeral materials, and 31 (91.1%) classify them. Of the states that do classify ephemera, all do so by means of their state documents scheme, and one state indicated another scheme as well, probably the one used for the general collection. Three (8.8%) alphabetize them and two (4.7%) accession them (the same two indicated that they class them with state documents).

"Mississippi ephemera are not cataloged in OCLC, are not included in the Mississippi Union Catalog, but are classified using a general msdocs number [according to their official classification scheme]". (8) Ephemeral material is indexed at the back of the monthly checklist publication Mississippi State government publication index. New York State treats it's ephemera in a similar manner, though now classed with a -0 publication type code.

Hypothesis 3: Most states would use established classification schemes to control their state's publications.

Only 15 (35.7%) of the 42 responding institutions employ major schemes, namely the LC, DDC, Jackson, and Swank schemes. Other states have either developed their own, have used

archival practices, or else have no formal arrangement for the control of their state documents. Twenty five, 59.5%, use their own classification scheme.

In his study of the use of government documents by social scientists, Peter Hernon found that one reason for non-use of government publications was that "faculty are unfamiliar with the arrangement of the documents collection".(9) Depending upon the characteristics of the institution under consideration, the method used to control state documents may or may not have an effect on their subsequent use. The need for subject access by certain types of users, lawyers for instance, has been questioned. According to Doris Dale, "Although lawyers are interested in the subject, the topic of law is pursued through the jurisdiction".(10)

The scheme developed by Richard Swank is used by two (5%) of the classifying institutions. Swank wrote of his scheme that "this classification, if viewed as a set of filing rules with notation added, is not unlike the alphabetical arrangement of government authors in the dictionary card catalog. The shelflist therefore doubles as an author catalog and, insofar as government agencies deal with well defined subject fields, also as a subject catalog".(11)

Ellen Jackson's scheme is used by one responding institution. It, like the Swank scheme, is based on the archival principle of provenance. From the copies of in-house developed schemes returned in the survey, I found that most of them are similar, having an acronym for the issuing department, followed by a publication type code, and cuttered or further divided by title abbreviation or accession number.

The Dewey scheme is used by seven (16.6%) of responding institutions which classify state documents, two of them using a modified Dewey scheme. Gordon Stevenson wrote of the scheme in 1974 that "looking into the future, DDC has the capability of developing into a system that can exploit some of the potentials of the computer and at the same time provide a system of classification numbers for shelving materials". (12)

If searching by Dewey number on national databases is ever implemented, as it has been proposed, the access to Dewey classed materials will be greatly enhanced. In any case, "the proper scheme for any library has to be made to serve the library. The library should not be made to serve the scheme".(13)

Hernon and McClure found that "in seeking access to the information content of state publications, respondents often consulted card catalogs or browsed the shelves".(14) Considering that most of the schemes developed in-house by the institutions in this study are basically archival in nature, it seems unlikely that browsing would result in

satisfactory retrieval by the user. This would depend upon whether the stacks are even open to users. Considerations for further study in this area are presented in the appendix.

A closed stacks environment will not be impacted by any scheme in the same way an open stacks environment would. Closed stacks require more staff assistance in the retrieval of documents than open stacks but user problems would not crop up as much. Where state documents stacks are open, the implementation of a familiar scheme would certainly have an impact on user satisfaction.

Archival Repositories

The argument for an archives being the best repository for state documents is well known. Ernst Posner is perhaps most recognized for his position on this topic, and he has written that "record sets of state publications are part of the permanently valuable documentation of the state; hence these sets, together with the unpublished records, should be preserved in the state archival agency, where they should be protected from the wear and tear resulting from frequent use".(15)

In a 1984 study conducted by archivist Richard Cox, he surveyed archival agencies in all 50 states, and based on a response from 41 of those agencies was able to isolate and comment on numerous aspects of the question of archivist vs. librarian responsibility for state publications. He found that "even within the environment of the state archives, the state government publications seem to be treated as library materials".(16) He discovered that, "about half of the archives have tried to follow the principle of provenance, arranging the publications by creating or sponsoring agency, while the remainder have used traditional library cataloging systems".(17)

Only six of the 41 responding institutions in his survey reported that they were satisfied with the management of state materials. The value of these publications within the realm of a state archives can not be disputed. They are part and parcel of the agencies which issue them and in Margaret Lane's view, "there is something to be said for an archival collection- arranged with respect for the provenance of the materials and stored so that loss and damage are minimized. Likewise it is appropriate to have the state agency's published records available for use in conjunction with the archival records."(18) The archival preservation ethic is a tremendous factor to be considered in any attempt to resolve the problem. Perhaps distribution of one copy of all publications to both the state archives and the state library might be one possible solution.

Obtaining State Documents

A - Selection and Acquisition

The processes of selection and acquisition of state documents have been presented by Terry Weech in Collection development and state publications. Weech states that, "although there are attempts at comprehensive bibliographic control of state publications, the task is extremely complex and the goal of complete coverage remains an elusive one."(19) In many states, the problem lies in the agencies themselves and the manner in which they interpret legislation.

The selection process therefore involves the need to have correspondence with agencies of interest, as well as access to the checklists of the state document authorities. The limitations of the state checklists are similar to those of the Monthly Checklist of State Publications put out by the Library of Congress.

States can include in their checklists only the materials they receive and the guidelines adopted by the Government Documents Round Table of the ALA say that states "should provide the most complete listing of the state's publications as is possible".(20) As far as this is possible, some states have therefore stressed that their lists are selective.

B - Legislation/Solicitation

Of the institutions responding to this survey, thirty five (87.5%) indicated that they use solicitation, and 40 (100%) indicated that they use legislation to acquire documents. Yet the effectiveness of legislation is questioned by many. Although all states report the existence of legislation, they also report that their checklists are not comprehensive.

In regard to questions toward the need for legislation, it is true that, "although a legal requirement that the state agencies furnish copies of their publications is no guarantee that they will do so, obviously the program is much stronger with such a legal requirement than without one". (21)

"Just as important as the inclusion of a policy statement in the text of the legislation is a complete understanding on the part of librarians, legislators and citizens of the reasons for depository legislation".(22) The who, what, when, where, and why of acts must be made clear. Perennial changes in legislation wreak havoc with state agencies and they may be unable to keep up with all the changes.

Agency obligations to depositories and printing agencies remain the major problem areas of legislation. Often the power of enforcement is not given to the distributor. For example, the response from Vermont on the question of how they obtain their state's documents was that they do so by solicitation and legislation but that the legislation "is on the books, but not enforced". Their problem is not unique.

It would seem that effective legislation would preclude the need to obtain state documents by solicitation, but as pointed out, legislation is often not very effective. Making legislators aware of libraries' needs may be difficult.

C - Exchange

Of the institutions responding to this survey, 3(7.5%) indicated that they receive their own state's publications by exchange. The arrangement for obtaining state documents by exchange is perhaps the least desirable method. The fact that all responding states rely on legislation is encouraging.

D - Gifts/other

South Carolina responded to question 2d on the questionnaire, about methods used to obtain state publications with "gifts, or any way at all". Only eight, (19%) indicated that they obtain state publications by any means other than legislation, solicitation and exchange. Pennsylvania replied "staff awareness, newspaper articles, T.V. Radio announcements on new publications - patron and I.L.L requests" (in addition to legislation and solicitation). Other sources included agency publication lists and purchasing.

E - Centralized and decentralized publishing

As far as publishing goes, having a centralized publishing agency is the best way to achieve complete coverage of state agencies' output, though this may not be feasible in some states. With decentralized printing, "agencies may lose familiarity with the laws requiring deposit of their publications; or they may believe that their publications are too minor or specialized to be subject to the law". (23)

Without the locus of control afforded by centralized publishing, complete coverage is doubtful, and only nine states currently have centralized publishing.

The apparatus developed at the federal level, the Government Printing Office, as grand as it is, can not be held up as an ideal since even the GPO has not achieved comprehensive coverage of federal publications. The lack of a centralized publisher in many states is a chief reason for failure of complete coverage of publishing agency's output.

The distribution centers lack authority to enforce legislation and agencies are confused concerning the reporting of state document publishing. What is needed in cases where there is no centralized publisher is a concerted effort to educate agencies in the necessity for cooperation in the development of comprehensive publication lists, and to send those lists to the proper unit, usually the distribution center. The question of an agency's need to publish has been discussed in the literature but is beyond the scope of this paper.

Automation

Automation is an area where cooperative efforts between those professionals who are responsible for the maintenance of state documents, whether archivist, documents librarian, or another brand of information professional, will determine the breadth and extent of future developments. Increased search capabilities, either by Dewey number, local control number, or subject term, will eventually put all methods of internal control by institutions on an even keel.

Nakata and Kopec feel that "it is incumbent upon librarians working with state and local documents to identify, locate and acquire as many publications as possible and to input bibliographic data into databases, where this option is available. Inputting, however, should follow standards so that there can be interaction among different library systems". (24)

In regard to OCLC being an example of how a national union list of state documents might be feasible, Terry Weech found that, in a study done in Illinois in 1980, OCLC members which served as depositories input into OCLC less than half of the 252 distributed state publications used in the study. Whether the situation has improved since is not known. Information on other states was not uncovered by Weech in his literature search.

The Guidelines for inputting state documents into data bases, adopted by the GODORT of ALA state only that "the institutions will input full original cataloging in MARC format."(25) Refer to appendix VII for data on states which have their own classification scheme code in the 086 field.

Along with increased use of national databases will come an increased need for an information intermediary, between the published and unpublished material of government and the citizen or user. As Weech points out, there will be a need for "a government information specialist who would be instilled with the commitment of the archivist to preserving materials, the commitment of the documents librarian to information dissemination, and the skills of the information system administrator".(26) He proposed that this might be accomplished as part of a six year degree program.

An automated retrieval system was developed at the University of Guelph, Ontario, for the efficient retrieval of government documents. In reference to this system, now called the CODOC system, formerly the Guelph document system, Peter Hernon feels that, "even if libraries do not adopt the CODOC system, they are reminded that there is at least one system that enriches access to information content and downplays format, issuing agency, and the level of government producing the information".(27)

On the regional scale, there is a plethora of automated systems. The ability to tie into systems regardless of geographic locale is perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the potential of automation in general. What is clear from the literature on the subject is that information centers will increasingly rely on access to a wide range of systems for some time to come.

Reference

A particular institution's policy in regard to integration will also have an impact on reference services. The proximity of the separate documents collection to the rest of the holdings in the institution is an important issue.

As with federal documents, state documents have special indexes and finding aids which should be available in the immediate vicinity of the documents themselves. In organizing state publications, it is wise to separate out those materials which have reference value and give them special treatment.

Hernon and McClure argue effectively for the need to combine government documents and general reference services within the same area and this would necessitate a proficiency on the part of the reference personnel in the use of all manner of document, general, and other special reference sources. Yet, "improved bibliographic access to government publications as a means for better reference service is largely an issue of staff training, knowledge of government reference tools and indexes, and exploiting new technologies to increase bibliographic control, regardless of the existing method of collection organization".(28)

Presenting one instance of legislation, which was sent along with the return questionnaire and stresses reference services, the Illinois Administrative Code outlines the duties of the states depository libraries, stating that "the depository library must make reference service available not only to the library's primary users but to all Illinois citizens. Cataloging of the documents is required in order to make state documents easily accessible and retrievable."(29) This is an example of legislation that recognizes the dynamic nature of reference service and cataloging and classification practices, and adheres to the guidelines for depository libraries adopted by the ALA.

Depositories

Integral to the collection policies of state document institutions is the concept of depositories and their relationship to the overall status of state publications in general. The selection of depositories should depend less on geographical location, although that is an important factor, and more on the adequacy of the institution to house such a collection. The publication State depository for public documents: Handbook for state agencies and depository libraries presents standards for Mississippi's depository libraries. One of the primary criteria given is that the depository space "shall be adequate for the housing of the collection. All parts of the collection shall be readily accessible, preferrably on open shelves".(30) Even here, the meaning of open shelves can be ambiguous, though the essential message is adequately conveyed.

According to the guidelines adopted by GODORT, distribution of state publications to depositories should include distribution to the Library of Congress and the Center for Research Libraries. Nakata and Kopec found that "almost all state libraries report distribution of their publications to the Library of Congress and many libraries send their publications to the Center for Research Libraries. More states send publications to the former than to the latter, and a few states do not send to either".(31) States may tend to provide copies to some of their own depositories first. As it is, depositories receive copies of documents only when the supply warrants distribution and the distribution center may have difficulty obtaining even a single copy.

A 1979 GODORT survey revealed that the number of depositories within each state varied considerably, from 4 in both Vermont and Tennessee to 186 in New York State. Margaret Lane found confusion in some states, to the degree that some institutions did not realize they had depository status, while others thought they had it, but did not.

The need for non-depository libraries to collect state documents has been questioned by Hernon and McClure. Part of their reason for questioning such practices is that "the development of union lists of holdings, effective document delivery systems, and depository library programs can relieve individual libraries of the burden of collecting and retaining lesser needed publications".(32) The development of cooperative regional programs for the effective limited distribution of state documents would certainly reduce a state's costs for publication of agency materials.

Conclusion

Since the type and scope of agencies may differ dramatically from state to state, it would seem to be advantageous for an institution to keep other states' documents separate from their own. Agency codes or other designators would likely lead to confusion when dealing with a multiplicity of states.

The method of control of a particular state documents collection has implications beyond the in-house treatment and access of those documents, and state documents librarians must be aware of the methods employed in other states if progress is to be made. Yet the particular method used to control state documents may not be a primary concern, as long as they can be effectively retrieved. Where the state archives is currently responsible for the official collection of state documents, as in Kentucky and Alabama, perhaps a state library should be designated as well. The two types of institution are at variance and yet complement one another.

The future of automation may hold the answer to many current problems associated with the control of state documents. Increased use of OCLC and RLIN, for instance, will make documents from all states more accessible, regardless of the method of control employed within particular institutions.

The ideal of a national union list of state publications may not be entirely pie in the sky. By taking advantage of developing technologies it may be possible to raise all states to a level of agreement in methods of control of state publications. Some states have a lot of work to do, others perhaps very little in comparison. There is currently no best method for the control of state documents. Of all the 50 states surveyed, only two, Virginia and Tennessee, employ the same methods of control of state documents.

More cooperative efforts between states are necessary. But as Margaret Lane points out, "although librarians are interested in what other states are doing, this interest is counterbalanced by the feeling that one's own state is unique".(33) States are different in many aspects, but each produces material that is potentially invaluable to people in

other states. It may just be a matter of time.

Recommendations For Further Study

Not all states are able to collect and make available all publications of their particular state, including ephemeral material. Whether or not they should is a question beyond the scope of this survey and is an area which requires further study.

The integration of state documents into the general collection has implications which require further study. This might be combined with a study of users browsing an archival arrangement.

More research should be done on the inputting of state documents into national databases Also, in a 1966 study conducted by Margaret Lane, she found that "there is a definite correlation between the states sending the most documents to the Library of Congress and the states which issue checklists". (34) Although today, most states do issue checklists, it might be helpful to match them against the Monthly Checklist of State Publications put out by the GPO.

It would be interesting to discover whether any states have re-distribution policies. Often, state publications are routed back to the state libraries in the form of gifts and then may be either discarded, entered into their holdings, or put in storage, possibly for distribution. A policy for keeping track of these publications might be undertaken.

Notes

1) Alabama Dept. of Archives. [leaflet] Untitled.

2) Annotated Code of Maryland. Section 23-2A-01 of the Education Article. Definitions.

3) The state of the state document [brochure]. Minnesota Legislative Reference Library.

4) Michigan Documents Classification Scheme. Library of Michigan. 1986 p.1.

5) Public Documents. Louisiana State Library. No. 75 July-Dec. 1986. p.ix

6) Alderman, Alice. Classifying state documents. Documents to the people. 4:58 May 1976. p.58

7) Heenan, Thomas. "Classification of local publications."Special Libraries. Feb. 1974. p.73.

8) Mississippi state government publication index. v.3:27 Sept. 1987.p.ii.

9) Hernon, Peter. Use of government publications by social scientists. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.; 1979. p.40-41.

10) Dale, Doris Cruger. "The development of classification systems for government publications". Library Resourses and Technical Services. 13:4 Fall, 1969. p.475.

11) Swank, R. "A classification for state, county and municipal documents." Special Libraries. 35:4 Apr. 1944. p.117.

12) Stevenson, Gordon. "The Historical context: Traditional classification since 1950". Drexel Library Quarterly. v.10 Oct. 1974. p.19.

13) Alderman, Alice. "Classifying state documents". Documents to the people. 4:58 May 1976. p.61.

14) Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles. Public access to government information: Issues, trends and strategies. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.; 1984. p.356

15) Posner, Ernst. American state archives. Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1964. p.347.

16) Cox, Richard. State government publications and archival institutions. NASARA Clearinghouse. v.7:2 Dec. 1974 p.5.

17) ibid. p.5

18) Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn. Greenwood Press. 1981. p.31.

19) Weech, Terry. "Collection development and state publications". Government Publications Review. v.8A:1-2 1981. p.47.

20) Reprinted in: Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn. Greenwood Press. 1981. p.194.

21) Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn. Greenwood Press. 1981. p.4.

22) ibid. p. 63.

23) Butch, Dorothy. New York State documents: An introductory manual. Albany, N.Y. New York State Library 1987 p.114.

24) Nakata and Kopec. "State and local government publications". Drexel Library Quarterly. 16:4 Oct. 1980 p.56

25) Reprinted in: Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn. Greenwood Press. 1981.p.195.

26) Weech, Terry. "New technology and state government information sources" In: New technology and documents librarianship. p.86.

27) Hernon, Peter. New Technology and documents librarianship. Conn. Meckler Pub. p.xiv

28) McClure, Charles R. and Hernon, Peter. Improving the quality of reference service for government publications. Chicago, American Library Association. 1983. p.141.

29) Illinois Administrative Code. Subtitle B. Section 3020.220 Citizen access to publications.

30) State depository for public documents: Handbook for state agencies and depository libraries. Jackson, Miss. Mississippi Library Commission. 1985. p.7.

31) Nakata and Kopec. State and local, p.45

32) Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles. Public access to government information: Issues, trends and strategies. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp.; 1984. p.351.

33) Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn. Greenwood Press. 1981. p.xvii.

34) Lane, Margaret T. "State documents checklists". Library Trends. 15:1 July, 1966. p. 119.

Bibliography

Alabama Dept. of Archives. [leaflet] Untitled.

Alderman, Alice. "Classifying state documents". Documents to the people. 4:58 May 1976.

Annotated Code of Maryland. Section 23-2A-01 of the Education Article. Definitions.

Buchanan, Brian. "Theory of Library Classification".(Outlines of Modern Librarianship; vol. 11). London: Clive Bingley, 1979.

Butch, Dorothy. New York State documents: An introductory manual. Albany, N.Y.: New York State Library, 1987.

Castonguay, Russell. A Comparative guide to classification schemes for local government documents collections. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Cataloging government documents: A manual of interpretation for AACR2. Chicago: American Library Association, 1984.

Childs, James B. Government document bibliography in the United States and elsewhere. 3rd ed., Washington, D.C.: Gov't. Print. Off., 1942.

Clarke, Norman F. "Cataloging, classification and storage of government publications". Library Trends. v.15 July, 1966.

Cox, Richard. State government publications and archival institutions. NASARA Clearinghouse. v.7:2 Dec. 1974

Daily, Jay E. Organizing nonprint materials. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1986.

Dale, Doris Cruger. "The development of classification systems for government publications". Library Resourses and Technical Services. 13:4 Fall, 1969.

Fry, Bernard. Government publications: Their role in the National Program for Library and Information Services. Washington, D.C.: National Commission On Libraries and Information Science, 1972.

Haselhuhn, R. "Bibliographic control and distribution of state documents". RQ. vol. 20 Fall 1980.

Heenan, Thomas. "Classification of local publications". Special Libraries. Feb. 1974.

Hernon, Peter. New Technology and documents librarianship. Conn. Meckler Pub. p.xiv

Hernon, Peter. Use of government publications by social scientists. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1979.

Hernon, Peter and McClure, Charles. Public access to government information: Issues, trends and strategies. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corp., 1984.

Hyman, Richard J. Shelf classification research: Past, present - Future?. U. of Illinois Occassional Papers, no.146, Nov. 1980.

Illinois Administrative Code. Subtitle B. Section 3020.220 Citizen access to publications.

Intner, Sheila S. "Interfaces" [column]. Technicalities. 7:8 Aug. 1987.

Lane, Margaret T. State publications and depository libraries: A reference handbook. Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Lane, Margaret T. "State documents checklists". Library Trends. 15:1 July, 1966.

McClure, Charles R. and Hernon, Peter. Improving the quality of reference service for government publications. Chicago: American Library Association, 1983.

Michigan Documents Classification Scheme. Library of Michigan, 1986.

Mississippi state government publication index. v.3:27 Sept. 1987.

Morehead, Joe. Introduction to United States public documents. Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1975.

Nakata, Yuri and Kopec, Karen. "State and local government publications". Drexel Library Quarterly. 16:4 Oct. 1980.

New Technology and documents librarianship. Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Government Documents and Information Conference. Columbus, Ohio: Meckler Publishing, 1983.

Palic, Vladamir M. Government publications: A guide to bibliographic tools incorporating government organization manuals: A bibliography. New York: Pergamon Press, 1977?

Parish, D.W. State government reference publications. Littleton, Co.: Libraries Unlimited, 1974.

Posner, Ernst. American state archives.Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Public Documents. Louisiana State Library. No. 75 July-Dec. 1986.

A Report on N.Y.S. in-house printing. Albany, N.Y.: Division of the Budget, 1973.

Review of state agency publications, Program Review and Investigations Committee. Research Report no. 224. Frankfort, Kentucky: Legislative Research Committee, 1986.

Richardson, John, et al. "Bibliographic organization of U.S. federal depository collections". Gov. Pub. Rev. 7A:6 1980.

Richmond, Phyllis. "The future of classification". Drexel Library Quarterly. 10:4 Oct. 1974.

Shupak, Harris. "Classification: A Definition". Drexel Library Quarterly. 10:4 Oct. 1974.

Standards for library functions at the state level. Chicago: American Library Association, 1985.

State depository for public documents: Handbook for state agencies and depository libraries. Jackson, Miss.: Mississippi Library Commission, 1985.

The state of the state document [brochure]. Minnesota: Legislative Reference Library, 19??.

Stevenson, Gordon. "The Historical context: Traditional classification since 1950". Drexel Library Quarterly. v.10 Oct. 1974.

Swank, R. "A Classification for state, county and municipal documents". Special Libraries. 35:4 Apr. 1944.

Weech, Terry. "Collection development and state publications". Government Publications Review. v.8A:1-2 1981.

Appendix I: A copy of the Questionnaire

1) Does your institution maintain the official collection of state documents for your state? Yes___ No___

---If not, where is the collection located?

2) How does your institution obtain your state's publications: (Circle all that apply)

a) Solicitation

b) Legislation

c) Exchange

d) Other (please specify)

3) Do you collect documents from other states? Yes___ No___

---If so, are they integrated with documents from your own state?

4) Approximately how many documents in the collection:

---From your own state

---From other states

5) Do you classify documents from:

a)Your own state. Yes___ No___

---If yes, how?

Is there a publication which spells out the scheme? Yes___(please list) No___

b)Other states. Yes___ No___

---If yes, how?

Is there a publication which spells out the scheme? Yes___(please list) No___

6) Do you collect ephemeral material from your state government? (eg. posters, pamphlets, publicity brochures).
Yes___ No___

---If yes, are they controlled? Yes___ No___

How:

a) classed with state documents

b) classed separately

c) alphabetized

d) accessioned

7) Are state document materials included in the central catalog in your library? Yes___ No___

8) Is there a publication (such as a checklist) which lists your state°s documents.
Yes___Please indicate title. No___

Check here if you want a copy of the final report ___

Appendix II

State Publications Checklists From Responding States

Alabama - No checklist

Alaska - State and local publications received. (annual microfiche catalog)

California - California state publications

Colorado - Index to Colorado state publications

Checklist of Colorado state publications available in microfiche

Connecticut - Checklist of publications of Connecticut state agencies

Florida - Florida public documents

Georgia - Checklist of official publications of the state of Georgia

Hawaii - Hawaii documents cumulative index

Idaho - No checklist

Illinois - Illinois documents list (monthly)
Publications of the state of Illinois (annual)

Indiana - Checklist of Indiana state documents

Iowa - Iowa documents; a catalog of state publications

Kansas - State documents of Kansas catalog (microfiche)

Kentucky - Kentucky monthly checklist of state publications

Louisiana - Public documents (semi-annual)
Official publications (quinquennial)

Maine - Government publications checklist (monthly)
Index to Maine state documents (annual)

Maryland - Maryland state publications

Massachusetts - Commonwealth of Massachusetts publications received by the state library (quarterly)
Massachusetts state publications (annual)

Minnesota - LRL checklist

Mississippi - Mississippi state government publications index (monthly)

Nebraska - Nebraska state publications checklist

Nevada - No title provided

New Hampshire - Checklist of New Hampshire State Departments publications (biennial)

New York - A Checklist of official publications of the state of New York

North Carolina - Checklist of official North Carolina state publications

North Dakota - No title provided

Ohio - Ohio documents

Oklahoma - Oklahoma government publications: a checklist

Pennsylvania - Checklist of official Pennsylvania publications (monthly)

Rhode Island - No title indicated

South Carolina - Checklist of South Carolina state publications (quarterly/cumulative index)

South Dakota - Monthly checklist of state publications

Tennessee - A List of Tennessee state publications

Texas - Texas state documents

Utah - Utah under cover

Vermont - Checklist of available state publications (suspended until 1988)

Virginia - Checklist of Virginia state publications
Virginia state publications in print

Washington - Washington state publications (annual; fiche)

West Virginia - Checklist of state publications (quarterly)

Wisconsin - Wisconsin public documents

Wyoming - The Outrider

Appendix III

Characteristics of Responding State Document Authorities

Alabama

Arrangement
Own state: None
Other states: NA (Not Applicable)

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Alaska

Arrangement
Own state: LC
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

California

Arrangement
Own state: California Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: "Prior to 1982, arranged by state/agency".

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes. "Included in online catalog (monographs only)from 1979 on; before 1979 in departmental catalog".

Colorado

Arrangement
Own state: Own classification scheme
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Connecticut

Arrangement
Own state: Own classification scheme (unpublished)
Other states: Dewey, converting to LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Florida

Arrangement
Own state: Dewey
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Georgia

Arrangement
Own state: "In-house expansion of Dewey Decimal
353.(numbers & letters)"
Other states: (same)

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Hawaii

Arrangement
Own state: Jackson
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Idaho

Arrangement
Own state: None
Other states: None

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Illinois

Arrangement
Own state: Dewey
Other states: Dewey

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Indiana

Arrangement
Own state: Dewey. "added to the division's monograph and serial collection".
Other states: LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No. "Integrated with our general collection. Indiana State documents are integrated with the Indiana collection".

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Iowa

Arrangement
Own state: Swank
Other states: Not classed

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : No response

Kansas

Arrangement
Own state: Kansas State Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: Dewey

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Kentucky

Arrangement
Own state: "Records group code, publications are managed as state agency output, access is at the series level".
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Louisiana

Arrangement
Own state: "Louisiana Documents Classification, Dewey".
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Maine

Arrangement
Own state: "A classification scheme which is similar to
that used for federal documents". (unpub.)
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Maryland

Arrangement
Own state: LC
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Massachusetts

Arrangement
Own state: "Our own system based on Dewey, entered on
OCLC".
Other states: "LC, entered on OCLC".

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Michigan

Arrangement
Own state: Michigan Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: Not classed

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : "selected, at
present"

Minnesota

Arrangement
Own state: LC
Other states: LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : Yes

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Mississippi

Arrangement
Own state: Mississippi State Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Nebraska

Arrangement
Own state: Own scheme, published in Guide to Nebraska State Agencies
Other states: NA (only collect other states' checklists)

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Nevada

Arrangement
Own state: Swank
Other states: LC. "If we decide to keep them & catalog them, we use LC classification".

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No. "We collect only California documents. They are kept in a separate room with their own classification scheme".
Include state documents in central catalog? : No

New Hampshire

Arrangement
Own state: Dewey
Other states: Dewey

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

New York

Arrangement
Own state: New York State Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: Dewey

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

North Carolina

Arrangement
Own state: Classification scheme for North Carolina state publications
Other states: NA.

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? :(Note: "we receive a few but do not really collect them-are put on a shelf by state".

Include state documents in central catalog? : "No, however, within a year or so we expect to have an online catalog for the entire library and it will include state documents".

North Dakota

Arrangement
Own state: Own classification scheme
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Ohio

Arrangement
Own state: Ohio Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Oklahoma

Arrangement
Own state: "Alpha-numeric system". (unpub.)
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Pennsylvania

Arrangement
Own state: Border-Sulzer classification scheme. Published in Revised classification scheme for Pennsylvania state Publications, 1987.
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Rhode Island

Arrangement
Own state: Modified Dewey Decimal
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

South Carolina

Arrangement
Own state: South Carolina state documents classification system
Other states: NA. "except a few in Dewey".

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : "collect a few-government manuals, statistical abstracts, etc. that are included as regular materials".

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

South Dakota

Arrangement
Own state: "A system that is vaguely similar to SUDOCS; the other depositories are free to use it or LC or Dewey or local classification".
Other states: NA
Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Tennessee

Arrangement
Own state: LC
Other states: LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : Yes

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Texas

Arrangement
Own state: Texas State Documents Classification Scheme
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Utah

Arrangement
Own state: Own classification scheme
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes (subject)

Vermont

Arrangement
Own state: Dewey
Other states: "arranged alphabetically by state".

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Virginia

Arrangement
Own state: LC
Other states: LC

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : Yes

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

Washington

Arrangement
Own state: Modified Dewey (unpub.)
Other states: (same)

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : No

Include state documents in central catalog? : Yes

West Virginia

Arrangement
Own state: "Cataloging and classification of documents at Wisconsin Historical Society Library".
Other states: NA

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : Partial

Wisconsin

Arrangement
Own state: "By state agency, utilizing the Wisconsin State Documents Classification System".
Other states: By issuing agency

Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : "Each state has a separate collection arranged by issuing agency".

Include state documents in central catalog? : "Only Wisconsin documents since 1976".

Wyoming

Arrangement
Own state: Wyoming Documents Classification System
Other states: NA
Integrate documents from own state
with documents from other states? : NA

Include state documents in central catalog? : No

Appendix IV - Collection sizes

	Collect Other state's Documents	Size of Collection Own state's documents	Size of Collection Other state's documents
Alabama	No	Unknown	NA
Alaska	No	15,000	NA
California	Yes	200,000	80,000
Colorado	No	6,500 cataloged 4-6,000 unprocessed	NA
Connecticut	Yes	50,000	Unknown
Florida	No	20,000	NA
Georgia	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Hawaii	No	43,000	NA
Idaho	No	20,000	NA
Illinois	Yes	536,000	Unknown
Indiana	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Iowa	Yes	7,000	2,000
Kansas	Yes	20-30,000	NA
Kentucky	No	? Dated from 1840-	NA
Louisiana	No		
Maine	Yes	85,000	Unknown
Maryland			
Massachusetts	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Michigan	Yes	100,000 +	5,000 +
Minnesota	Yes	15,000	Unknown
Mississippi	No	32,500 _+_	NA
Nebraska	Yes	50,000	1,500
Nevada	Yes	30,000	700
New Hampshire	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
New York	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
North Carolina	No	113,000	NA
North Dakota	No	70,000	NA
Ohio	Yes	50,000	1,000
Oklahoma	No	50,000	NA
Pennsylvania	No	25,000	NA
Rhode Island	No	Unknown	NA
South Carolina	No	40,000	NA
South Dakota	No	41,393 paper, 31 fiche 2 reels microfilm	NA
Tennessee	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Texas	No	50,000 titles	NA
Utah	No	Unknown	NA
Vermont	Yes	10,000	20,000
Virginia	Yes	Unknown	Unknown
Washington	Yes	118,000	100,000
West Virginia	No	Unknown	NA
Wisconsin	Yes	50,027 (27,355 fiche)	100,150
Wyoming	No	7,000	NA

Appendix V - Arrangement of own state's documents

	Dewey	Swank	LC	Jackson	Own	Archives
Alabama						X
Alaska			X			
Arizona						
Arkansas						
California					X	
Colorado					X	
Connecticut					X	
Delaware						
Florida	X					
Georgia	Modified Dewey					
Hawaii				X		
Idaho	No arrangement					
Illinois	X					
Indiana	X					
Iowa		X				
Kansas					X	
Kentucky						X
Louisiana					X	
Maine					X	
Maryland			X			

Appendix V - Arrangement of own state's documents

	Dewey	Swank	LC	Jackson	Own	Archives
Massachusetts					X	
Michigan					X	
Minnesota			X			
Mississippi					X	
Nebraska					X	
Nevada		X				
New Hampshire	X					
New York					X	
North Carolina					X	
North Dakota					X	
Ohio					X	
Oklahoma					X	
Pennsylvania					X	
Rhode Island	X					
South Carolina					X	
South Dakota					X	
Tennessee			X			
Texas					X	
Utah					X	
Vermont	X					
Virginia			X			
Washington	Modified Dewey					
West Virginia					X	
Wisconsin					X	
Wyoming					X	

	Methods of obtaining own state publications. eg.Solicitation, legislation, exchange, other
Alabama	Solic., Legis.
Alaska	Legislation
California	Solic., Legis.
Colorado	Legis., Other
Connecticut	Solic., Legis., Gifts
Florida	Solic., Legis., Gifts
Georgia	Legislation
Hawaii	Solic., Legis.
Idaho	Solic., Legis.
Illinois	Solic., Legis.
Indiana	Solic., Legis.
Iowa	Solic., Legis.
Kansas	Solic., Legis.
Kentucky	Legislation
Louisiana	Solic., Legis., Exchange
Maine	Solic., Legis.
Maryland	Legislation
Massachusetts	Solic., Legis.
Michigan	Solic., Legis.
Minnesota	Solic., Legis.

Methods of obtaining own state publications. eg.Solicitation, legislation, exchange, other	
Mississippi	Solic., Legis.
Nebraska	Solic., Legis.
Nevada	Solic., Legis., Exch., Gifts
New Hampshire	Solic., Legis.
New York	Solic., Legis., Exch., Gifts
North Carolina	Solic., Legis.
North Dakota	Solic., Legis.
Ohio	Solic., Legis.
Oklahoma	Legislation
Pennsylvania	Solic., Legis., Staff Awareness, user requests
Rhode Island	Solic., Legis
South Carolina	Solic., Legis., Gifts
South Dakota	Solic., Legis.
Tennessee	Solic., Legis.
Texas	Solic., Legis.
Utah	Legis., Purchasing
Vermont	Solic., Legis.
Virginia	Solic., Legis.
Washington	Solic., Legis.
West Virginia	Solicitation
Wisconsin	Solic., Legis.
Wyoming	Solic., Legis.

APPENDIX II.E. SOURCE CODES (SUBFIELD ‡2) - PART 2: GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION NUMBER FIELD (FIELD 086)

ardocs	Arkansas state documents classification scheme. (Little Rock: Arkansas State Library, Documents Services Section, State Publications Unit)
azdocs	Arizona documents: KWOC manual. (Phoenix: State Documents Center, Arizona Dept. of Library, Archives and Public Records)
cadocs	California state agency authority list and class numbers. (Sacramento: The Library, Government Documents Dept., California State University, Sacramento)
codocs	Colorado State Publications Depository and Distribution Center. Classification schedule. (Denver: Colorado State Library)
iadocs	Classification of Iowa State documents by the State Library of Iowa. (Des Moines: State Library of Iowa)
ksdocs	State documents of Kansas: list of classes. (Topeka: State Library of Kansas)
ladocs	Louisiana documents classification schedule. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Library)
midocs	Michigan documents classification scheme. (Lansing: Michigan Dept. of Education, State Library Services)
modocs	Missouri state documents classification: post-reorganization agency codes and form divisions. (Jefferson City: Missouri State Library)
msdocs	Mississippi state government publications. Vol. 1 (July 1975/June 1980)- (Jackson: Mississippi Library Commission)
ncdocs	Classification scheme for North Carolina state publications: as applied to the Documents Collection of the North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, Division of State Library. (Raleigh: The State Library)
nmdocs	The New Mexico state documents classification system. (Santa Fe: New Mexico State Library)
ohdocs	Ohio documents classification scheme. (Columbus: State Library of Ohio)
okdocs	Oklahoma state documents classification and list of Oklahoma state agencies from statehood to the present. (Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Dept. of Libraries)
ordocs	OrDocs: history authority list and classification scheme for Oregon state agencies. (Salem: Oregon State Library)
padocs	Classification scheme for Pennsylvania state publications. (Harrisburg: State Library of Pennsylvania)

APPENDIX II.E. SOURCE CODES (SUBFIELD ‡2) - PART 2: GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION NUMBER FIELD (FIELD 086)

sudocs	Superintendent of Documents Classification System. [OBSOLETE. Use first indicator value "0" (Superintendent of Documents Classification System) in field 086 instead of this code.] [Refers to the U.S. Government Printing Office's classification system. This system is a card-file not a publication.]
txdocs	Texas state documents classification & almost compleat list of Texas state agencies from statehood to the present. (Austin: Legislative Reference Library & Government Publications Library, Texas State Library) (Updated monthly in TEXAS STATE DOCUMENTS)
undocs	United Nations document series symbols. 1946/77- (New York: United Nations)
utdocs	Utah documents classification schedules. (Salt Lake City: Utah State Library Division)
widocs	Organizing Wisconsin public documents: cataloging and classification of documents at the State Historical Society Library. (Madison: Division for Library Services, Bureau for Reference and Loan Services)
nydocs	New York State ~~Documents~~: An Introductory Manual. Albany: New York State Library. "Appendix," and the New York State ~~Library~~ Documents Authority File (available for purchase from the New York State Library).
scdocs	South Carolina State Documents classification system, Columbia: South Carolina State Library